

January 22, 1976

as it stands and I would like to comment on Senator Syas' question as to whether or not this would trigger a sales tax. I would call the members attention that this is not going to trigger the sales tax or income tax. It is the amount that you appropriate that is going to trigger it, whether it is 1%, 2% or 3%, as long as there is any. If you appropriate more than what can be raised by certain rates, then you are going to trigger the sales and income tax. This has nothing to do, as I hear remarks occasionally, with idle funds laying in the Treasury. It is a one time function that is used. The time rates are set and it has, for the purpose which has been pointed out by Senator Carsten, to allow for some flexibility in the prediction of revenues which is a certain amount of guesswork no matter how precise you try to be with your estimating figures and this is to allow for some room in error of judgment there, and more importantly, it is the kind of thing that is necessary to maintain adequate cash flows during those periods of the year when there are heavy withdrawals from the General Fund in relation to the amount of revenue coming in. So I would hope that the body does not assume that this legislation is determining sales and income tax rates, and the only reason, the only reason, that it was dropped in the special session from 2 to 3 was because the other alternative was to reduce the appropriations by that amount and which was declined to do. But you can't operate on that narrow a margin year in and year out without running into serious cash flow problems and this procedure will protect the state from that reoccurring.

PRESIDENT: Mr. Clerk. Do you have a motion, Mr. Clerk?

CLERK: Mr. President, I move to amend LB 651 and reinsert the 3 to 7. Signed Senator Stull.

SENATOR STULL: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, this amendment would give the State Board of Equalization a little flexibility in setting the tax rates. I think if we go to 5 to 7 where they are in a fairly narrow margin, I don't oppose the 7%. We permit most local subdivisions of government to actually carry up to 50% of their needs for the next fiscal year. Now I am not advocating that in any way the state government gets into the area where they might carry over that much of a reserve but I think that we should go back to the 3% and it wouldn't require quite as much money. All the time, our total amount of money that we are levying is going up so 3% of what we are levying now means a larger reserve of what amounted to 5% a few years ago. I just think that 3 to 7 would be a better formula. There would be more flexibility in it for the Board of Equalization.

PRESIDENT: Senator Cope.

SENATOR COPE: Mr. President, members, I support LB 651. I think this will give the Board more latitude in setting rates and I think the 3% is the most important, the minimum, as I cannot see the Board of Equalization setting